

[Mr. Speaker]

[18th January 1964]

I told him that he should not do so. In this connection I wish to inform the members the scope of discussion on the Governor's Address.

The Governor's address is similar to the President's Address to the Union Parliament and the Queen's Address to the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The Queen's speech in the United Kingdom is a statement of policy framed by the Cabinet and delivered at the beginning of every session. The responsibility for the speech rests wholly with the Cabinet. The Queen's Speech is answered by an humble Address which affords an opportunity for a wide debate. There is a general debate upon the policy of the Government as outlined in the speech and then there is a debate on the amendments moved by the Opposition advocating alternate policies which are expressed in the form of regret for the omission from the speech of the policies advocated. Members while speaking should not use the Queen's name irreverently or to influence debate.

In Canada, which has a parliamentary system of Government, the Prime Minister writes the speech from the Throne for the Governor-General to deliver to the Parliament indicating the chief measures to be considered during the session. Members are allowed much freedom and it is therefore possible to talk about anything under the sun and yet be in order. But even here reference to Governor-General or the Queen in an irreverent way or to influence the debate is not allowed.

Similarly the Address of the President of India to the Union Parliament is a statement of policy of the Government of India. A member could criticise the speech. In the Lok Sabha in 1956 a member said that the Address by the President looks like a third class report by an under-Secretary or by a bureaucrat. Objection was taken that the member was making disparaging remarks about the statement of the Head of the State. But the Chair ruled that the President is only a mouthpiece of the Government and therefore, a member has a right to say that the Address is not what he expected it to be. Again in 1960, when there was a criticism of the President, the Prime Minister observed as follows:—

“ The President's Address is a statement of policy of the Government. It should be remembered, it is the Government that is responsible for it, and it is not right or proper for our respected President's name to be brought in debates like this. If the President's Address has anything wrong in it or objectionable in it, it is the Government to blame, not the President, and it is open to the Hon. members to criticise or condemn Government because there is some such statement in it which they disapprove of.”

The Lok Sabha Rules of Procedure also provide that there should not be any reflection on the conduct of persons in high authority and that the President's name should not be used to influence the debate.

18th January 1964]

[Mr. Speaker]

The Address of the Governor to the Madras Legislature on the 16th January 1964 is a statement of policy of the Government of Madras. It has been drafted by the Government and read by the Governor. The discussion should therefore be on the matters referred to in the Address. It is also difficult to separate matters which are not referred to. Discussion is therefore allowed on matters which are not referred to by bringing them in the form of amendments.

In Madras also we have Rules regulating the debate on the Governor's Address. Rule 7 of the Madras Legislative Assembly Rules states that the rules of debate relating to Government Motions shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the debate on the Governor's Address. Rule 67 states among other things that a member while speaking must not reflect on the conduct of the Governor and that the Governor's name should not be used for the purpose of influencing the debate. Subject to this, the members may praise or criticise the administrative policy contained in the speech and also any other matters raised by amendment to the Motion of Thanks and that they should not criticise the Governor.

III—DISCUSSION ON THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS.

* SRI C. CHIRANJEEVULU NAIDU: Mr. Speaker, Sir, While thanking the Governor for the address that he has delivered to the Joint Session of the Legislature on the 16th January 1964, I would like to say a few words.

9-30
a.m.

The uneasiness and difficulties felt by the agriculturists are to a great extent today being reflected in their day-to-day agricultural operations. Mainly Sir, the rural economy has not improved to the extent that we expected and the rural indebtedness has increased and the agriculturists are faced with indebtedness to a great extent. This has risen by 200 to 300 per cent. Today, the agriculturists are feeling a sort of nervousness and uneasiness. The Planners and Executors of the Five-Year Plans have not given top priority for all these agricultural operations. They have not given their due share in this respect. Now Sir, under the Panchayats Act, Panchayat Unions have been constituted. In the preamble of the Panchayats Act, it has been stated that to create incentive to the agricultural production, Panchayat Unions have been constituted. But today, it has not served the purpose. Panchayat Unions have been entrusted with certain subjects like Elementary Education, formation of roads and the welfare of the villages. These could have been done by entrusting the work to the respective departments. Regarding agricultural production much has not been achieved by the Panchayat Unions. The Extension Officers, who have been entrusted with the work of creating a sort of incentive to the agriculturists, are not functioning well. By constituting Panchayat Unions, agricultural production has not increased in any way.